

May 7, 2003

CERTIFIED MAIL - RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Alex Herrell
Lennar Communities
25129 The Old Road, #316
Stevenson Ranch, CA 91381

RE: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT/OAK TREE PERMIT CASE NO. 01-094-(5)
 One mile west of Stevenson Ranch Pkwy & Pico Canyon Road, Dead Horse Canyon

Dear Applicant:

The Regional Planning Commission, by its action of March 26, 2003, **APPROVED** the above described conditional use permit and oak tree permit case.

The applicant or **ANY OTHER INTERESTED PERSON** may **APPEAL** the Regional Planning Commission's decision to the Board of Supervisors through the office of Violet Varona-Lukens, Executive Officer, Room 383, Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, 500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. Contact the Executive Office for the necessary forms and the amount of the appeal fee at (213) 974-1426. The appeal must be postmarked or delivered in person within 15 days after this notice is received by the applicant.

If no appeal is made during this 15-day period, the Regional Planning Commission action is final. Upon completion of the 15-day period, the applicant can submit to the Department of Regional Planning staff the acceptance affidavit and any fees, deposits, plans or other materials required by the permit conditions. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact the Zoning Permits Section at (213) 974-6443.

Very truly yours,

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING
James E. Hartl, AICP, Director of Planning

Kerwin Chih
Supervising Regional Planner
Zoning Permits Section

Enclosures: Findings and Conditions, Affidavit (Permittee's Completion).

c: Board of Supervisors; Department of Public Works (Building and Safety); Department of Public Works (Subdivision Mapping); Zoning Enforcement; Testifiers

KC:MBM

**CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT AND OAK TREE PERMIT CASE NO. 01-094-(5)
FINDINGS AND ORDER OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION**

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING DATE: January 8, 2003

SYNOPSIS:

The applicant is requesting a conditional use permit to authorize the excavation, removal and transportation of material and implementation of an approved California Department of Fish and Game Habitat Restoration Plan on 8.4 acres located in the Dead Horse Canyon area of the Santa Clarita Valley. The applicant is also requesting an oak tree permit for the encroachment within the protected zone of five (5) oak trees. No oak trees are proposed for removal or relocation. The purpose of the Habitat Restoration Plan is to comply with conditions of approval and implement related off-site mitigation measures for the previously approved development of Stevenson Ranch Phases I, II, and III. The subject property consists of mitigation areas located within Phase V of the Stevenson Ranch development. Prior to commencement of the work required by the Habitat Restoration Plan, the applicant will be required to obtain approval of a realignment of Pico Canyon Road by the Interdepartmental Engineering Committee of the Department of Public Works as the currently proposed alignment of Pico Canyon Road traverses a portion of the project site, but there are no plans to construct the road in connection with this project.

PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE COMMISSION:

January 8, 2003

A duly noticed public hearing was held on January 8, 2003. Commissioner Helsley was absent.

Three (3) representatives of the applicant testified, describing the work that would be involved to restore the site and responding to questions posed by the Commission.

Five (5) people testified in opposition to the request, based primarily on the proposed realignment of Pico Canyon Road. The opposition testimony indicated that the road realignment, if built, would impact oak trees; an environmental impact report is required for the widening of Pico Canyon Road; a phase I assessment may be required; noise impacts must be analyzed; and impacts to cultural resources have not been adequately analyzed.

There being no further testimony, the Commission, after discussion, voted (4-0) to close the public hearing, indicate its intent to approve the conditional use permit and oak tree permit, and direct staff to prepare the final environmental documentation and findings and conditions for approval.

Findings

1. The applicant is requesting a Conditional Use Permit to authorize grading (excavation, removal and off-site transportation) of 57,600 cubic yards of material and implementation of an approved California Department of Fish and Game Habitat Restoration Plan. The applicant is also requesting an Oak Tree Permit to authorize the encroachment into the protected zone of five (5) oak trees.
2. The applicant proposes to implement the approved Habitat Restoration Plan, which involves restoring and enhancing approximately 8.4 acres of disturbed and degraded riparian habitat, creating habitat restoration areas on the subject

property. A 4.6-acre habitat restoration area (“primary mitigation area”), will consist of stepped waterfalls and meandering stream channels. In addition, smaller pockets of disturbed land totaling 3.8 acres (“smaller mitigation area”) to the west will be restored by removing non-native grassland and re-vegetating with native plantings propagated from adjacent areas. 7.04 acres of the Habitat Restoration Plan are provided as a mitigation measure for previously approved phases I, II, and III of the Stevenson Ranch development. An additional 1.36 acres are provided as a mitigation measure for a previously approved project adjacent to the Stevenson Ranch Phase III site. To create these restoration areas, approximately 57,600 cubic yards of cut will be required, 40,200 cubic yards of which will be cut at the primary mitigation area and an additional 17,400 cubic yards of which will be cut at the smaller mitigation areas. All 57,600 cubic yards of cut will be exported and used in the development of Tract 33608 (Stevenson Ranch Phase III), approximately one mile east of the habitat restoration area.

3. The subject property is located in Dead Horse Canyon, approximately one mile west of the intersection of Stevenson Ranch Parkway and Pico Canyon Road, Santa Clarita, in the Newhall Zoned District. The topography varies from flat to steep slopes containing native vegetation, oak woodland, non-native grasslands and disturbed riparian habitat. Unpaved and paved roads extend north from Pico Canyon Road to the primary mitigation area.

The 4.6-acre primary mitigation area is located on the north side of Pico Canyon Road, in previously disturbed areas used for former oil wells known as Ferguson 9-2 and Ferguson 8 and later for storage of equipment, which was removed in 2000.

Six smaller mitigation areas totaling 3.8 acres are located further west on the south side of Pico Canyon Road.

4. The subject property is zoned A-2-5 (Heavy Agricultural – 5 acre required area).
5. Surrounding zoning consists of A-2-5 and R-1-5000 to the north, A-2-5 to the south and east, and A-2-2 and A-2-5 to the west.
6. The project site is currently vacant and was previously used as a storage facility for building materials, storage containers, inoperable vehicles and water tank trailers. Portions of the site are devoid of vegetation and covered with asphalt surface. A degraded channel with riparian scrub and an abandoned oil well also exist on-site.
7. Surrounding land uses consist of:
 - Desert, Single-family residences to the north;
 - Desert to the south;
 - Residential acreage, single-family residences, and desert to the east; and
 - Single-family residences and desert to the west.
8. The subject property is located within the proposed Stevenson Ranch Phase V project site, and applications are currently pending for a Plan Amendment and Specific Plan for 3,532 dwelling units, a Zone Change from A-2-2 and A-2-5 to Specific Plan, a Development Agreement and a Highway Realignment for Pico Canyon Road (Case No. 98-182-(5)). An environmental impact report is currently being prepared for the Stevenson Ranch Phase V project. The subject restoration

project is not part of the Stevenson Ranch Phase V project; it was initiated by the applicant to implement required off-site mitigation measures for the previously approved development of Stevenson Ranch Phases I, II, and III.

9. Conditions of this grant will insure that future nearby development does not encroach upon the area set aside for this restoration project. A conservation easement to preserve the area as natural open space will be recorded after restoration work is complete, to the satisfaction of the County Counsel.
10. The applicant's site plan depicts the proposed areas for grading on approximately 8.4 acres, the proposed transport route for the export of materials, on-site oak trees and the existing and proposed alignments of Pico Canyon Road. The site plan depicts fifty-nine (59) oak trees located within the restoration area. Five (5) oak trees, of which one (1) is heritage size, are identified for possible encroachment during grading. These trees are labeled numbers 2, 3, 15, 18 and 20 on the applicant's site plan; the heritage oak is tree number 2. No oak trees are proposed for removal or relocation.
11. The subject property is depicted within the Urban 2, Hillside Management, and Floodway/Floodplain land use categories in the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan. The Urban 2 category is intended for residential development with a maximum density of 3.4 to 6.6 dwelling units per acre. Hillside Management Areas are intended to ensure that development will occur in the most suitable and least environmentally sensitive areas, and will be of a scale and intensity that is compatible with the natural resource values and character of the area. The Floodway/Floodplain classification provides guidelines to ensure that only development with the appropriate flood protective measures will occur within floodways and floodplains identified by the Department of Public Works or the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
12. The Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan does not directly address the creation of habitat restoration areas; however, the plan authorizes grading within hillside management and floodplain areas subject to certain guidelines. The applicant will be required to meet grading requirements to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works and other public agencies, as applicable, pursuant to the recommended guidelines of the Floodplain Management Area and Hillside Management Area development standards of the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan. Implementation of the proposed habitat restoration plan is consistent with the subject property's land use classification and the goals and policies of the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan.
13. An oak tree report has been prepared by Land Design Consultants, a certified arborist. The Los Angeles County Forester and Fire Warden, Forestry Division, has reviewed the arborist's report and determined that the report is accurate and complete as to the location, size, condition and species of the oak trees on site. The Forester and Fire Warden has recommended approval of the requested encroachments subject to conditions of approval set forth in its letter dated October 24, 2002.
14. In conjunction with the implementation of the Habitat Restoration Plan, but not a part of this application, the applicant is proposing the realignment of Pico Canyon Road, as the current proposed alignment traverses the project site. The realignment is necessary to show that a feasible, alternative alignment exists that

does not encroach on the restoration site. The applicant will not construct the road in connection with this project. Appropriate environmental review of the construction of Pico Canyon Road, including impacts on this restored habitat, will be performed at such time as the road is proposed to be constructed in connection with future development proposals.

15. An archaeological review was conducted during the initial study phase and a condition requiring the applicant to cease work should a potential archaeological site be discovered on-site will adequately protect potential cultural and archaeological resources.
16. The project site will be preserved as open space and will not require vehicular access or public services.
17. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the environmental document reporting procedures and guidelines of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study identified potentially significant geotechnical, flood, water quality, biota and archaeological impacts of the project. Prior to the release of the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Study for public review, the applicant made or agreed to revisions in the project that would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur. The Initial Study and project revisions that there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the Commission, that the project as revised may have a significant effect on the environment. Based on the Initial Study and project revisions, the Department of Regional Planning has prepared a Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project. Conditions or changes in the proposed project are necessary in order to ensure the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment, and a Mitigation Monitoring Program has been designed and included as a condition of approval of this grant.
18. Prior to the public hearing, staff received several public comments in opposition to the request. Those opposed were concerned about environmental impacts, specifically the impacts to oak trees caused by the construction of the realigned Pico Canyon Road. The applicant is not proposing any road construction at this time, but is demonstrating conceptually that a feasible alternative to the current alignment exists.
19. The goal of the subject Habitat Restoration Plan is to mitigate the loss of dry stream channels during the development of Stevenson Ranch Phases I, II, and III by creating riparian woodlands, riparian scrub, and wetlands. Non-native vegetation and soils will be excavated to depths of 12 feet; the 12 feet will bring the lower areas to within three to five feet of the water table. The smaller areas south of Pico Canyon Road will also be excavated to remove the ruderal and non-native grasses, and then re-vegetated with native cuttings from adjacent riparian vegetation.
20. The long-term goal of this plan is to establish a mature, self-sustaining native riparian plant community that will provide valuable habitat for wildlife populations. This is expected to take approximately three to five years, however, a variety of wildlife is expected to utilize the habitat within one to three years following the initial planting. A temporary irrigation system will be installed to support the plantings

during the first five years. The habitat restoration areas, and a buffer area, will be dedicated as permanent open space. Only wildlife uses are projected for these areas.

21. Any future development in the surrounding area should not be situated such as to impact this mitigation site, including consideration of fire clearance zones.
22. The Commission finds that, with appropriate restrictions as set forth in the conditions of approval, the proposed use will be compatible with surrounding land uses.

BASED ON THE FOREGOING, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION CONCLUDES:

REGARDING THE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT:

- A. The proposed use is consistent with the adopted general plan for the area;
- B. The proposed use at the proposed location will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area, will not be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site and will not jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare;
- C. The proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the required development features, or as is otherwise required in order to integrate said use with the uses in the surrounding area;
- D. The proposed site is adequately served by highways or streets of sufficient width and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate, and by other public or private facilities as are required;
- E. The proposed project is located and designed so as to protect the safety of current and future community residents, and will not create significant threats to life and/or property due to the presence of geologic, seismic, slope instability, fire, flood, mud flow, or erosion hazard;
- F. The proposed project is compatible with the natural, biotic, cultural, scenic and open space resources of the area;
- G. The proposed development demonstrates creative and imaginative design, resulting in a visual quality that will complement community character and benefit current and future community residents;

REGARDING THE OAK TREE PERMIT:

- H. The proposed development will be accomplished without endangering the health of the remaining oak trees subject to Part 16 of Title 22 of the County Code on the subject property;

- I. The proposed oak tree encroachments will not result in soil erosion through the diversion or increased flow of surface waters which cannot be satisfactorily mitigated; and
- J. The proposed oak tree encroachments will not be contrary to or be in substantial conflict with the intent and purpose of the oak tree permit procedure.

AND, THEREFORE, the information submitted by the applicants and presented at the hearing substantiates the required findings for a conditional use permit as set forth in Sections, 22.56.090, and 22.56.2100, Title 22, of the Los Angeles County Code (Zoning Ordinance).

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

1. The Regional Planning Commission has considered the Mitigated Negative Declaration together with any comments received during the public review process, finds on the basis of the whole record before the Commission that there is no substantial evidence the project will have a significant effect of the environment, finds that the Mitigated Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Commission, and adopts the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program for the project.
2. In view of the findings of fact and conclusions presented above, Conditional Use Permit Case No. 01-094-(5) and Oak Tree Permit Case No. 01-094-(5) are **APPROVED** subject to the attached conditions.

VOTE: (5-0)

Concurring: Helsley, Bellamy, Valadez, Rew, Modugno

Dissenting:

Abstaining:

Absent:

Action Date: March 26, 2003

RJF:MBM

**CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT & OAK TREE PERMIT CASE NO. 01-094-(5)
FINAL CONDITIONS**

1. This grant authorizes the use of the subject property for the excavation, removal and transportation of 57,600 cubic yards of material from the project site along an approved haul route to an offsite location approximately one mile east of the subject property and for the encroachment into the protected zone of five (5) oak trees, as depicted on the approved Exhibit "A" and implementation of an approved California Department of Fish and Game Habitat Restoration Plan, subject to all the following conditions of approval.
2. Unless otherwise apparent from the context, the term "permittee" shall include the applicant and any other person, corporation, or other entity making use of this grant.

3. This grant shall not be effective for any purpose until the permittee, and the owner of the property, if other than the permittee, have filed at the office of the Department of Regional Planning their affidavit stating that they are aware of, and agree to accept, all of the conditions of this grant and that the conditions of the grant have been recorded as required by Condition No. 8, and until all required monies have been paid pursuant to Conditions Nos. 9, 10, and 11.
4. The permittee shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the County, its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the County or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul this permit approval, which action is brought within the applicable time period of Government Code Section 65009. The County shall notify the permittee of any claim, action, or proceeding and the County shall reasonably cooperate in the defense.
5. In the event that any claim, action, or proceeding as described above is filed against the County, the permittee shall within ten days of the filing pay the Department of Regional Planning an initial deposit of \$5,000, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted for the purpose of defraying the expenses involved in the department's cooperation in the defense, including but not limited to, depositions, testimony, and other assistance to permittee or permittee's counsel. The permittee shall also pay the following supplemental deposits, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted:

If during the litigation process, actual costs incurred reach 80 percent of the amount on deposit, the permittee shall deposit additional funds sufficient to bring the balance up to the amount of the initial deposit. There is no limit to the number of supplemental deposits that may be required prior to completion of the litigation.

At the sole discretion of the permittee, the amount of an initial or supplemental deposit may exceed the minimum amounts defined herein.

The cost for collection and duplication of records and other related documents will be paid by the permittee in accordance with Los Angeles County Code Section 2.170.010.

6. This grant will expire unless used within 2 years from the date of approval. A one-year time extension may be requested, in writing with the payment of the applicable fee, at least six months before the expiration date.
7. If any provision of this grant is held or declared to be invalid, the permit shall be void and the privileges granted hereunder shall lapse.
8. Prior to the use of this grant, the property owner or permittee shall record the terms and conditions of the grant in the office of the County Recorder. In addition, upon any transfer or lease of the subject property during the term of this grant, the property owner or permittee shall promptly provide a copy of the grant and its terms and conditions to the transferee or lessee of the subject property.

9. Within fifteen (15) days of the approval date of this grant, the permittee shall remit processing fees payable to the County of Los Angeles in connection with the filing and posting of a Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21152 of the Public Resources Code. The project is not *de minimis* in its effect on fish and wildlife and is not exempt from payment of a fee to the California Department of Fish and Game pursuant to Section 711.4 of the Fish and Game Code. The current fee amount is **\$1,275.00**.
10. The subject property shall be maintained and operated in full compliance with the conditions of this grant and any law, statute, ordinance, or other regulation applicable to any development or activity on the subject property. Failure of the permittee to cease any development or activity not in full compliance shall be a violation of these conditions. Prior to the use of this grant, the permittee shall deposit with the County of Los Angeles the sum of **\$750.00**. These monies shall be placed in a performance fund which shall be used exclusively to compensate the Department of Regional Planning for all expenses incurred while inspecting the premises to determine the permittee's compliance with the conditions of approval. The fee provides for five (5) annual inspections. The inspections shall be unannounced.

If additional inspections are required to ensure compliance with the conditions of this grant, or if any inspection discloses that the subject property is being used in violation of any condition of this grant, the permittee shall be financially responsible and shall reimburse the Department of Regional Planning for all additional inspections and for any enforcement efforts necessary to bring the subject property into compliance. Inspections shall be made to ensure compliance with the conditions of this grant as well as adherence to development in accordance with the approved site plan on file. The charge for additional inspections shall be the amount equal to the recovery cost at the time of payment. The current recovery cost is \$150.00 per inspection.

11. The permittee shall comply with all mitigation measures specified in the attached "Project Mitigation Measures Due to Environmental Evaluation" in accordance with the attached Mitigation Monitoring Program. As a means of ensuring the effectiveness of the mitigation measures set forth in the attached Mitigation Monitoring Program, the permittee shall submit mitigation monitoring reports to the Department of Regional Planning for review and approval as required by said department. The reports shall describe the status of compliance with the mitigation measures adopted as conditions of this grant. As provided in the Mitigation Monitoring Program, the applicant shall deposit the sum of **\$3,000.00** with the Department of Regional Planning within thirty (30) days of the approval date of this grant to defray the cost of reviewing the required mitigation monitoring reports and verifying compliance with the Mitigation Monitoring Program.
12. This oak tree permit shall terminate upon the completion of all authorized oak tree encroachments and all required mitigation and monitoring, to the satisfaction of the County Forester and Fire Warden, Forestry Division.
13. Notice is hereby given that any person violating a provision of this grant is guilty of a misdemeanor. Notice is further given that the Regional Planning Commission or a hearing officer may, after conducting a public hearing, revoke or modify this grant, if

the Commission or hearing officer finds that these conditions have been violated or that this grant has been exercised so as to be detrimental to the public health or safety or so as to be a nuisance.

14. Upon approval of this grant, the permittee shall contact the Fire Prevention Bureau of the Los Angeles County Forester and Fire Warden to determine what facilities may be necessary to protect the property from fire hazard. Any necessary facilities shall be provided to the satisfaction of and within the time periods established by said Department.
15. All requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and of the specific zoning of the subject property must be complied with unless specifically modified by this grant, as set forth in these conditions or shown on the approved plans.
16. Any structures shall comply with the requirements of the Division of Building and Safety of the Department of Public Works.
17. All structures, walls, and fences open to public view shall remain free of extraneous markings, drawings, or signage. These shall include any of the above that do not provide pertinent information about said premises. The only exceptions shall be seasonal decorations or signage provided under the auspices of a civic or nonprofit organization
18. In the event such extraneous markings occur, the permittee shall remove or cover said markings, drawings, or signage within 24 hours of such occurrence, weather permitting. Paint utilized in covering such markings shall be of a color that matches, as closely as possible, the color of the adjacent surfaces.
19. All material graded shall be sufficiently watered to prevent excessive amounts of dust during excavation and restoration of the habitat areas. Watering shall occur at least twice daily with complete coverage, preferably in the late morning and after project activities are done for the day. All clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation activities shall cease during periods of high wind (i.e., greater than 20 mph average over one hour) to prevent excessive amounts of dust. All materials transported off-site shall be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amount of dust.
20. All project activity shall be limited to those hours between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Saturday. All stationary construction or excavation noise sources shall be sheltered or enclosed to minimize adverse effect on nearby residences and neighborhoods. Generator and pneumatic compressors shall be noise protected in a manner that will minimize noise inconvenience to adjacent residences. Parking of worker vehicles shall be on-site.
21. If any potentially significant archaeological or cultural resources are discovered in the course of excavation or restoration of the habitat areas, all project activities shall cease in that immediate area and the site shall be preserved until a qualified archaeologist has made a determination as to the significance of the site or findings. Any significant archaeological or cultural resources shall be recovered to the extent practicable, as determined by a qualified archaeologist, before resuming project activities in that area of the site.

22. The permittee shall provide training regarding the proper care and protection of the subject oak trees for all contractors and crews involved in any excavation or restoration work on the project site. The permittee's consulting arborist shall prepare a schedule of work activities wherein the arborist will be present on the project site to ensure compliance with the oak tree ordinance and the protection of the oak trees.
23. Upon completion of the required habitat restoration areas to the satisfaction of the California Department of Fish and Game, the permittee shall dedicate to the County or other appropriate public agency a conservation easement, approved by the County Counsel, to preserve the habitat restoration areas and a suitable buffer area as natural open space, including an area of sufficient size to ensure that future alignment or construction of Pico Canyon Road will not reduce the viability of the habitat restoration area, as determined by the County biologist.
24. The permittee shall recreate the habitat restoration areas should a natural event destroy or damage all or more than fifty percent of the project site, as verified by the Impact Analysis Section of the Department of Regional Planning, while the County mitigation monitoring program or any applicable jurisdictional agency monitoring period is in effect. Natural events described in this condition include, but are not limited to, fire and flood.
25. The future extension of Pico Canyon Road shall not traverse any portion of the project site. The permittee shall dedicate a right of way 50 feet from the centerline on Pico Canyon Road or on an alignment to the satisfaction of the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works. The permittee shall also dedicate slope easements on Pico Canyon Road to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.
26. The property shall be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the approved Exhibit "A". In the event that revised plans are submitted, the permittee shall submit three (3) copies of the proposed plans to the Director for approval. All revised plans must be accompanied by the written authorization of the property owner.
27. Any transportation of heavy equipment and/or materials which require the use of oversized-transport vehicles on State highways will require a Caltrans transportation permit. Large size truck trips shall be limited to off-peak commute hours.
28. The permittee shall comply with all recommended conditions and requirements set forth in the County of Los Angeles Forester and Fire Warden, Forestry Division, letter, dated October 24, 2002, except as otherwise required by said Division. In addition, if any mitigation trees are planted, an acorn shall be planted within the watering zone of each replacement tree.
29. Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the permittee shall submit a map showing in sufficient detail the location of the sites from which all excavated materials are proposed to be removed, the proposed transport route over streets and highways, and the location to which such material is to be imported. All hauling of excavated materials shall be restricted to a route approved by the Director of Public Works.

30. Any surplus habitat created by this project shall not be construed as approval for future projects.
31. Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the permittee shall file an application for the proposed realignment of Pico Canyon Road with the County Interdepartmental Engineering Committee for its approval.
32. Prior to the encroachment into the protected zone of any oak tree as authorized by this grant, the permittee shall obtain all permits and approvals required for the work which necessitates such encroachment.

Attachments:

Project Mitigation Measures Due to Environmental Evaluation

Mitigation Monitoring Program

Letter from the Los Angeles County Forester & Fire Warden, dated October 24, 2002.

RJF:MBM

*** * * * INITIAL STUDY * * * ***

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING**

GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: June 27, 2001 Staff Member: Christina D. Tran

Thomas Guide: 4640 A-1 USGS Quad: Newhall

Location: Approximately one mile west of Stevenson Ranch Parkway and Pico Canyon Road intersection, in Dead Horse Canyon, adjacent to and just north and south of Pico Canyon Road; Stevenson Ranch

Description of Project: Application for a CUP to authorize grading of the project site in order to create a Department of Fish and Game habitat restoration area as a mitigation area for Phase I, II, and III of Stevenson Ranch, as well as create additional habitat that may be banked and used for other Stevenson Ranch Projects. This will include the construction of a retention basin, steeped waterfalls for energy dissipation, concrete meandering channels, concrete swales, and ripraps. Extensive grading will be required and the soil will be exported to Tract 33608 of Stevenson Ranch Phase III. In addition, applicant seeks an OTP to encroach upon 5 oak trees leaving 54 oak trees without any impacts in order to implement the project.

Gross Acres: 7.04 acres

Environmental Setting: Project site ranges from flat to steep slopes containing native vegetation,luvial sand scrubs, non-native grassland, oak woodlands, and disturbed riparian habitat that is a wildlife movement area. The site is predominantly vacant with an abandoned oil well site. It was previously used as a storage facility for building materials, storage containers, old cars, and water tank trailers. Surrounding uses consist of vacant land and residences under construction.

Zoning: A-2-5 (Heavy Agriculture, minimum lot size of 5 acres)

General Plan: Low Density Residential

Community/Area wide Plan: Urban 2, floodway/floodplain (Santa Clarita Valley Plan)

Major projects in area:

| PROJECT NUMBER | DESCRIPTION & STATUS |
|----------------|---|
| <u>TR33698</u> | <u>589 lots (545 SF, 21 MF) [9-14-88 recorded]</u> |
| <u>OT83013</u> | <u>Remove 119 oak trees [9-11-85 approved]</u> |
| <u>OT00259</u> | <u>Remove 13 oak trees [Pending]</u> |
| <u>SP98182</u> | <u>Plan amendment & SP for 3,532 DU [Pending]</u> |
| <u>ZC98182</u> | <u>From A-2-2 and A-2-5 to SP [Pending]</u> |

NOTE: For EIRs, above projects are not sufficient for cumulative analysis.

REVIEWING AGENCIES

| Responsible Agencies | Special Reviewing Agencies | Regional Significance |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> None | <input type="checkbox"/> None | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional Water Quality Control Board | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy | <input type="checkbox"/> SCAG Criteria |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Los Angeles Region | <input type="checkbox"/> National Parks | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lahontan Region | <input type="checkbox"/> National Forest | <input type="checkbox"/> Water Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Commission | <input type="checkbox"/> Edwards Air Force Base | <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Monica Mtns. Area |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Army Corps of Engineers | <input type="checkbox"/> Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mtns. Area | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>CSUF Archaeology</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>City of Santa Clarita</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Department of Conservation</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>DOGGR</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>SCOPE</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Trustee Agencies | <input type="checkbox"/> | County Reviewing Agencies |
| <input type="checkbox"/> None | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Subdivision Committee |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Fish and Game | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DPW: <i>Drainage & Grading, Geology & Soil, Environmental Programs</i> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Parks | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fire Department |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX | | ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details) | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|--------------------------------|--|
| | | | Less than Significant Impact/No Impact | | | |
| | | | | Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation | | |
| | | | | | Potentially Significant Impact | |
| CATEGORY | FACTOR | | | | | Potential Concern |
| HAZARDS | 1. Geotechnical | 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Liquefaction</i> |
| | 2. Flood | 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>100 year flood areas</i> |
| | 3. Fire | 7 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | 4. Noise | 8 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| RESOURCES | 1. Water Quality | 9 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>NPDES</i> |
| | 2. Air Quality | 10 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | 3. Biota | 11 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Riparian habitat, oak woodlands</i> |
| | 4. Cultural Resources | 12 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Potential cultural resources</i> |
| | 5. Mineral Resources | 13 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | 6. Agriculture Resources | 14 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | 7. Visual Qualities | 15 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| SERVICES | 1. Traffic/Access | 16 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | 2. Sewage Disposal | 17 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | 3. Education | 18 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | 4. Fire/Sheriff | 19 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | 5. Utilities | 20 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| OTHER | 1. General | 21 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | 2. Environmental Safety | 22 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | 3. Land Use | 23 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | 4. Pop/Hous./Emp./Rec. | 24 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 5. Mandatory Findings | 25 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Biota, liquefaction, water quality</i> |
|-----------------------|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|

DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM (DMS)

As required by the Los Angeles County General Plan, DMS* shall be employed in the Initial Study phase of the environmental review procedure as prescribed by state law.

- Development Policy Map
- Designation: Urban expansion
 - ☒ Yes ☐ No Is the project located in the Antelope Valley, East San Gabriel Valley, Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains or Santa Clarita Valley planning area?
 - ☐ Yes ☒ No Is the project at urban density and located within, or proposes a plan amendment to, an urban expansion designation?

If both of the above questions are answered "yes", the project is subject to a County DMS analysis.

☐ Check if DMS printout generated (attached)

Date of
printout: _____

☐ Check if DMS overview worksheet completed (attached)

EIRs and/or staff reports shall utilize the most current DMS information available.

Environmental Finding:

FINAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:

☐ NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

☒ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, in as much as the changes required for the project will reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally

determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.

☐ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT*, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above as "significant".

☐ At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The EIR is required to analyze only the factors not previously addressed.

Reviewed by: _____ Date: _____

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

☐ Determination appealed – see attached sheet.

*NOTE: Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.

HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

SETTING/IMPACTS

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| a. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone? <u>Liquefaction, earthquake induced landslides</u> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)? |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability? <u>Steep slopes on site</u> |
| d. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction? <u>Liquefaction</u> |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard? |
| f. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of over 25%? <u>Some grading on steep slopes</u> |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? |
| h. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? |

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Sections 308B, 309, 310, and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES
CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ **OTHER**

☐ Lot Size
DPW

☐ Project Design

☐ Approval of Geotechnical Report by

Detailed liquefaction and seismic stability analyses shall be conducted at grading/building plan stages.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **geotechnical** factors?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No Impact

☒ Less than significant with project mitigation

☐ Less than

HAZARDS - 2. Flood

SETTING/IMPACTS

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| a. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site? |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| <i>Streams</i> | | | | |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone? |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| <i>100 year flood areas</i> | | | | |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions? |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run-off? |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| e. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area? |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| <i>Existing channel areas to be recontoured and the streambed to be widened</i> | | | | |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors (e.g., dam failure)? |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| <hr/> | | | | |

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Section 308A ☐ Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)

☒ Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES
CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ **OTHER**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

Applicant shall comply with all conditions pertaining to drainage and grading required by the DPW

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **flood (hydrological)** factors?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☒ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than

HAZARDS - 3. Fire

SETTING/IMPACTS

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in a high fire hazard area (Fire Zone 4)? |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, width, surface materials, turnarounds or grade? |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area? |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards? |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)? |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard? |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? |

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Water Ordinance No. 7834 ☒ Fire Ordinance No. 2947 ☒ Fire Prevention Guide No.46
☐ Fuel Modification / Landscape Plan

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **fire hazard** factors?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

HAZARDS - 4. Noise

SETTING/IMPACTS

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)? |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity? |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project? |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project? |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? |

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Noise Ordinance No. 11,778 ☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225--Chapter 35

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES
CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ **OTHER**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by **noise**?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒

Less than

RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells? |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system? |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations <i>or</i> is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course? |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies? <i>Location adjoining to, bisected by, or discharging to a designated environmentally sensitive area, riparian corridor, or wetland</i> |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies? <i>Location adjoining to, bisected by, or discharging to a designated environmentally sensitive area, riparian corridor, or wetland</i> |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? |

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Industrial Waste Permit | <input type="checkbox"/> Health Code – Ordinance No.7583, Chapter 5 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Plumbing Code – Ordinance No.2269 (DPW) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NPDES Permit CAS614001 Compliance |

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES CONSIDERATIONS

☐ OTHER

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **water quality** problems?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☒ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than

RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential users or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for non-residential uses)? |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use? |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance per Screening Tables of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook? |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources that create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions? |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emission which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? |
| h. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? |

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Health and Safety Code – Section 40506

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Project Design ☐ Air Quality Report

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **air quality**?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

RESOURCES - 3. Biota

SETTING/IMPACTS

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located within Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural? |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas? |
| c. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue dashed line, located on the project site? <i>Channels / streams</i> |
| d. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g. coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian, woodland, wetland, etc.)? <i>Oak woodland, disturbed riparian habitat</i> |
| e. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)? <i>Oak trees</i> |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)? |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)? |

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES
CONSIDERATIONS**

☒ **OTHER**

☐ Lot Size
Permit

☐ Project Design

☐ ERB/SEATAC Review

☒ Oak Tree

Revegetation plan required

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, **biotic** resources?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☒ Less than significant with project mitigation

☐ Less than

RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological/Historical/Paleontological

SETTING/IMPACTS

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) that indicate potential archaeological sensitivity? <i>Oak trees, streams</i> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources? |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites? |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5? |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? |

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES
CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ **OTHER**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Phase 1 Archaeology Report

CSUF Resource Information Center concluded that no cultural resources were found at the project site

during survey. Stop work condition.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **archaeological, historical, or paleontological** resources?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☒ Less than significant with project mitigation

☐ Less than

RESOURCES - 5.Mineral Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES
CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ **OTHER**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **mineral** resources?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use? |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES
CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ **OTHER**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **agriculture** resources?

☒ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

SETTING/IMPACTS

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed? |
| b. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail? <hr/> <i>Proposed Pico Canyon Trail</i> |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area that contains unique aesthetic features? |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features? |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems? |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors (e.g., grading or landform alteration)? <hr/> <hr/> |

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES CONSIDERATIONS

☒ OTHER

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Visual Report ☐ Compatible Use

Site is to be restored to a natural habitat restoration area

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **scenic** qualities?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

SERVICES – 1. Traffic/Access

SETTING/IMPACTS

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the project contain 25 dwelling units, or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (mid-block or intersections)? |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions? |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions? |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area? |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded? |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or program supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus, turnouts, bicycle racks)? |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? |

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES
CONSIDERATIONS

☐ OTHER

☐ Project Design ☐ Traffic Report ☐ Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **traffic/access** factors?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

SETTING/IMPACTS

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant? |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site? |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste – Ordinance No. 6130

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES
CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ **OTHER**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **sewage disposal** facilities?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

SERVICES – 3. Education N/A

SETTING/IMPACTS

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create capacity problems at the district level? |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools that will serve the project site? |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create student transportation problems? |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand? |

e. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES
CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ **OTHER**

☐ Site Dedication ☐ Government Code Section 65995 ☐ Library Facilities Mitigation Fee

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **educational** facilities/services?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

SERVICES – 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

N/A

SETTING/IMPACTS

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site? |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area? |

c. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES
CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ **OTHER**

☐ Fire Mitigation Fee

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **fire/sheriff** services?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

SERVICES – 5. Utilities/Other Services
N/A

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

a. ☐ ☐ ☐

Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells?

| | | | | |
|----|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs? |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane? |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)? |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)? |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? |

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269 ☐ Water Code – Ordinance No. 7834

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **utilities** services?

☐ Potentially significant significant/No impact ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

SETTING/IMPACTS

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources? |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community? |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land? |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ State Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 5, T-20 (Energy Conservation)

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to any of the above factors?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety

SETTING/IMPACTS

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site? |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site? |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected? |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Have there been previous uses that indicate residual soil toxicity of the site? |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment? |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment? |
| h. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip? |
| i. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? |
| j. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? <i>Site contains an oil well</i> |

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Toxic Clean-up Plan

☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

Applicant obtained Report of Well Plugging and Abandonment from the Department of Conservation on

3/18/98.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact relative to **public safety**?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

SETTING/IMPACTS

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property? |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property? |
| c. | | | | Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria: |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Hillside Management Criteria? |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | SEA Conformance Criteria? |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other? |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project physically divide an established community? |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **land use** factors?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

OTHER FACTORS – 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation
N/A

SETTING/IMPACTS

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections? |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)? |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing? |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project result in substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)? |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents? |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **population, housing, employment, or recreational** factors?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made:

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? <u>Oak woodland, riparian habitat, native vegetation</u> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Does the project have possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects. <u>Water quality, cultural resources, geotechnical</u> |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? |

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the environment?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☒ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than